

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09922 01 OF 02 012036Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ISO-00 NSC-10 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10

NSAE-00 RSC-01 EUR-10 PM-03 SSO-00 INRE-00 DRC-01

/060 W

----- 006672

O 011818Z DEC 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 798

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 9922

LIMDIS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DECEMBER 1 DISCUSSION WITH UK AND FRG REPS

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: ON DECEMBER 1, US REP AND DEPREP HAD DISCUSSION WITH UK AND FRG REPS ON CURRENT STATUS OF VIENNA TALKS. AMONG THE SUBJECTS DISCUSSED WERE TREND TOWARD SEPARATE DISCUSSION AMONG EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON WAYS OF PROTECTING POTENTIAL EUROPEAN DEFENSE CO-OPERATION AGAINST ADVERSE EFFECTS FOR THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ISSUE OF POSSIBLE WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE COOPERATION MIGHT BE GAINING EXCESSIVE ATTENTION IN VIENNA TALKS. ALLIED REPS ALSO DISCUSSED WAYS OF MOVING VIENNA TALKS TOWARDS MORE DETAILED TREATMENT OF ALLIED NEGOTIATING PROPOSALS. THERE WAS A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE PRESENT STATUS OF ALLIANCE DISCUSSION ON STABILIZING MEASURES. END SUMMARY.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09922 01 OF 02 012036Z

2. US REP BEGAN BY INDICATING HE WOULD LIKE TO BRING UP EUROPEAN COMMUNITY ASPECTS OF MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. UK REP REPLIED HE WOULD LIKE TO GIVE BRIEF REPORT ON DISCUSSIONS WHICH HAD TAKEN PLACE AMONG EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS OF AD HOC

GROUP ON THE TOPIC OF PROTECTING POTENTIALITY FOR MOVE TOWARDS WESTERN EUROPEAN DEFENSE COOPERATION DURING THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. UK REP SAID THAT ONE MEETING OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS OF AD HOC GROUP HAD ALREADY TAKEN PLACE. SECOND MEETING WOULD TAKE PLACE ON DECEMBER 4. THESE MEETINGS WOULD BE CONTINUED UNTIL THEIR OBJECTIVE WAS ACHIEVED. THAT OBJECTIVE WAS TO FORMULATE FOR INDIVIDUAL TRANSMISSION TO THE CAPITALS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS WORKED OUT BY THOSE MEMBERS REGARDING THE SUBJECT MATTER DESCRIBED. THE JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD ALSO BE TRANSMITTED TO THE FRENCH FOR COMMENT. THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS WOULD THEN PRESENT THEIR JOINT VIEWS IN THE AD HOC GROUP.

3. UK REP SAID CONSIDERATIONS OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES WERE BASED ON RECOGNITION THAT SPECIFIC FORMS OF WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE COOPERATION HAD NOT BEEN WORKED OUT AND WERE FOR THE FUTURE. THE OBJECTIVE WAS TO DEVELOP A KIND OF NEGATIVE CHECK LIST OF THINGS TO BE AVOIDED IN THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS WHICH MIGHT INHIBIT THE POTENTIALITY OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO MOVE FORWARD TO DEFENSE COOPERATION, RATHER THAN A LIST OF POSITIVE PRESENTATIONS WHICH THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE ADVANCED IN THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS. SINCE IT WAS RECOGNIZED THAT WHAT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS WISHED TO DEFEND WAS A POTENTIAL RATHER THAN A PROJECT WITH A SPECIFIC OUTLINE, THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS HAD THUS FAR ONLY IDENTIFIED THIS GENERAL OBJECTIVE. THEY HAD IN ADDITION IDENTIFIED TWO FURTHER SPECIFIC POINTS OF CONCERN IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT. THE FIRST WAS THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO SUB-CEILINGS IN NATO FORCES OTHER THAN PERHAPS A SOVIET AND U.S. CEILING AS A RESULT OF PHASE I OR PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. THE SECOND WAS THAT THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD NOT RESULT IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL SEPARATE CENTRAL EUROPEAN AREA IN THE POLITICAL SENSE ALTHOUGH THIS WOULD NOT MEAN THAT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS CONTESTED THE USE OF THE NATO
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09922 01 OF 02 012036Z

GUIDELINES AREA AS THE REDUCTION AREA.

4. THE FRG REP POINTED OUT THAT THE DISCUSSION AMONG EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS WERE TAKING PLACE IN VIENNA BECAUSE THERE WAS NO ACCEPTED FORUM FOR THEM ELSEWHERE. THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY POLITICAL COMMITTEE HAD HELD ONE DISCUSSION OF THIS SUBJECT BUT THIS HAD NOT BEEN CONTINUED. IT WAS DIFFICULT TO HOLD THESE DISCUSSIONS OF THIS SUBJECT BUT THIS HAD NOT BEEN CONTINUED. IT WAS DIFFICULT TO HOLD THESE DISCUSSIONS AT NATO IN BRUSSELS OWING TO THE FRENCH POSITION. HENCE, VIENNA SEEMED THE ONLY LOGICAL PLACE. FRG REP SAID THAT ANOTHER GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS WAS TO AVOID INDIVIDUAL PRECEDENTS BEING ESTABLISHED IN PHASE I WHICH WOULD BE AUTOMATICALLY

CARRIED OVER TO PHASE II OF THE NEGOTIATIONS.

5. US REPS EXPRESSED UNDERSTANDING FOR THE WEST EUROPEAN DESIRE TO PROTECT POTENTIALITY OF DEFENSE COOPERATION AGAINST LIMITATION BY SOVIETS. US REPS POINTED OUT THAT WHEN CLOSER STUDY WAS GIVEN TO THE ENTIRE ALLIED NEGOTIATING PROGRAM FOR PHASE I, IT PROBABLY WOULD BE FOUND THAT ALMOST EVERY ASPECT OF THIS PROGRAM COULD BE CONSIDERED TO HAVE PRECEDENT CREATING CHARACTER FOR PHASE II. HENCE, UNLESS CONSCIOUS CARE WERE EXERCISED, EUROPEAN COMMUNITY MEMBERS COULD EASILY FIND THEMSELVES DISCUSSING DETAILS OF THE ENTIRE RANGE OF NEGOTIATIONS. US REPS POINTED OUT THAT IT WOULD BE UNFORTUNATE FOR COHESION OF ALLIED POSITION IF AD HOC GROUP WERE TO BE DIVIDED INTO SEPARATE SUBGROUPS. UK AND FRG REPS SAID THEY RECOGNIZED THIS POINT, BUT THEY BELIEVED THAT SPECIFICALLY WESTERN EUROPEAN ASPECTS OF NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD PROPERLY BE DISCUSSED INITIALLY BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES RATHER THAN BY AD HOC GROUP AS WHOLE.

6. US REPS COMMENTED THAT, SPEAKING AS ALWAYS IN THESE TRILATERAL DISCUSSIONS ON A PERSONAL BASIS, THEY WERE CONCERNED ABOUT THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE ISSUE OF POSSIBLE WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE COOPERATION, AS YET ONLY A THEORETICAL SUBJECT, HAD TENDED TO TAKE ON PROMINENCE IN THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS THUS FAR. THEY POINTED OUT THAT THE EMPHASES PLACED

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09922 01 OF 02 012036Z

ON THIS ISSUE BY EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AD HOC GROUP PARTICIPANTS IN PLENARY AND BILATERAL DISCUSSIONS WITH EAST WAS INTENSIFYING ALREADY HIGH SOVIET INTEREST IN THIS SUBJECT. THERE WAS SOME RISK THAT ABSTRACT DISCUSSION OF THIS TOPIC MIGHT BECOME THE PREDOMINANT THEME OF VIENNA TALKS TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE CHANCES OF PROGRESS. THE WAY TO DEAL WITH THIS RISK WAS TO LEAD NEGOTIATIONS INTO DETAILED DISCUSSION OF ASPECTS OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL.

7. UK AND FRG REPS AGREED THAT IT WAS HIGHLY DESIRABLE TO PREVENT THE WEST EUROPEAN DEFENSE COOPERATION ISSUE FROM BECOMING A FOCUS OF VIENNA TALKS. THEY SAID, HOWEVER, THAT ALLIES MUST STUDY VERY CAREFULLY ISSUE OF WHAT THEY WERE GOING TO OFFER TO THE SOVIETS IN ORDER TO GET INTO SPECIFICS AND WHAT THEY EXPECTED IN RETURN. US REPS SAID ALLIES SHOULD NOT BE OVERLY AMBITIOUS IN THIS REGARD. AS THEY

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09922 02 OF 02 012130Z

73

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ISO-00 NSC-10 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10

NSAE-00 RSC-01 EUR-10 PM-03 SSO-00 INRE-00 DRC-01

/060 W

----- 006842

O 011818Z DEC 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 799

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY LONDON IMMEDIATE

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T FINAL SECTION OF 2 VIENNA 9922

LIMDIS

FROM US REP MBFR

PERSONALLY SAW IT, THE POINT WAS TO BRING
THE SOVIETS TO NEGOTIATE ON THE GROUNDS OF THE ALLIED
PROPOSAL. BUT THIS COULD BE ACHIEVED ONLY THROUGH
A STEP-BY STEP PROCESS WITH LIMITED MOVEMENT IN
EACH STEP. THE FIRST STEP WOULD BE TO BRING THE
SOVIETS TO AGREE TO NEGOTIATE ON US/SOVIET FORCE
REDUCTIONS. IN THEIR PERSONAL VIEW, FOR THIS, LEAVING
ASIDE WHOLLY THE QUESTION OF ITS SPECIFIC FORMULATION,
STRINGENTLY LIMITED ASSURANCE ABOUT LINKAGE BETWEEN
THE TWO PHASES MIGHT BE NECESSARY. A NEXT LOGICAL
STEP WOULD BE TO BRING THE SOVIETS TO ACCEPT A
FOCUS ON GROUND FORCES AND TO RELINQUISH OR POSTPONE
THEIR DEMANDS FOR FOCUS ON AIR AND NUCLEAR FORCES.
THE ALLIES COULD NOT REALISTICALLY EXPECT THE
SOVIETS TO AGREE TO THE WHOLE OF THE ALLIED PROGRAM
FOR PHASE I IN ADVANCE, BUT AT BEST TO AGREE AT WHAT
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09922 02 OF 02 012130Z

POINT THE ENTIRE COMPLEX OF OPEN ISSUES MIGHT FIRST
BE ADDRESSED. IF THE ALLIES COULD BRING THE SOVIETS
TO ACCEPT DISCUSSING IN DETAILS THE ISSUE OF US/SOVIET
FORCE REDUCTIONS, BRING THEM TO ACCEPT FOCUSING THE
DISCUSSION ON GROUND FORCES AND THEN ACTUALLY BEGIN
DETAILED DISCUSSION OF US/SOVIET GROUND FORCE REDUC-
TIONS, THE ALLIES WOULD BE WELL ON THE WAY TO BRINGING
THE SOVIETS OVER TO NEGOTIATING ON THE GROUNDS OF

THE ALLIED PROPOSAL. WHEN AND IF THE SOVIETS AGREED TO FOCUS ON US AND SOVIET FORCES AND THEN ON GROUND FORCES, POSTPONING TREATMENT OF AIR AND NUCLEARS, THE ALLIES COULD BRING IN TO THE DISCUSSION THE ISSUE OF THE COMMON CEILING. THIS WAS PROBABLY THE PROPER SEQUENCE; TO START WITH AN EFFORT TO GET SPECIFIC DISCUSSION GOING ON THE COMMON CEILING WOULD OPEN THE ALLIES TO SOVIET EFFORTS TO INCLUDE NATIONAL FORCES AND NUCLEAR AND AIR FORCES.

8. UK AND FRG REPS SAID THEY COULD SEE THE LOGIC OF THIS WAY OF PROCEEDING. UK REP SAID THAT IF IT WERE LEFT TO HIM, HE MIGHT BE WILLING TO PROCEED IN THIS WAY. BUT THE ISSUES INVOLVED WERE ONES OF SUBSTANCE AND THESE MUST FIRST BE DISCUSSED IN THE NATO COUNCIL. AD HOC GROUP COULD NOT DISCUSS ISSUES OF SUBSTANCE. US REPS SAID THAT HIS VIEW DID NOT CONFORM TO THEIR CONCEPTION OF HOW THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD BE RUN. THEY POINTED OUT THAT AFTER DEVOTING A GREAT DEAL OF THOUGHT TO THE SUBJECT, THE COUNCIL HAD ADOPTED PARAGRAPH 68 OF THE AGREED NATO PAPER WHICH PROVIDED THAT IN THE EVENT THE NEGOTIATIONS TOOK A NEW TURN, THE AD HOC GROUP WOULD ANALYZE AND STUDY THE SITUATION AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL. THIS WAS THE PRESENT SITUATION. IT WOULD BE WHOLLY INEFFICIENT TO POSE NEW ISSUES TO THE COUNCIL IN GENERAL TERMS WITHOUT THE AD HOC GROUP HAVING CARRIED OUT ITS DELEGATED FUNCTIONS OF REFINING THEM AND LAYING OUT THE POSSIBLE DECISIONS. UK REP GRUDGINGLY AGREED THAT THIS EVNTUALITY WAS PROVIDED FOR IN NATO PAPER. HE SAID HE AGREED THAT RAPID ACTION OF THE SOVIETS IN TABLING A REDUCTION PROPOSAL AND THE FAILURE OF THE ALLIES THUS FAR TO AGREE ON PRE-SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09922 02 OF 02 012130Z

REDUCTION CONSTRAINTS OR STABILIZING MEASURES HAD IN FACT CREATED A NEW SITUATION. IN FACT, HE THOUGHT THAT IN GENRAL, ONE PROBLEM WAS THAT CAPITALS HAD NOT YET CAUGHT UP WITH THIS SHIFT IN EVENTS.

9. US REPS REITERATED THAT IT WAS RESPONSIBILITY OF AD HOC GROUP TO ANALYZE NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS AND TO MAKE AGREED RECOMMENDATION OR RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL REGARDING THEM. THE POINTED OUT THAT HIS SHOULD LOGICALLY BE THE MAIN TOPIC OF DISCUSSION IN THE AD HOC GROUP FOLLOWING THE MID-DECEMBER RECESS. FURTHERMORE, INDIVIDUAL AD HOC GROUP MEMEBERS SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE INDIVIDUAL ISSUES WERE WHEN THEY REPORTED TO CAPITALS FOLLOWING THE MID-DECEMBER BREAK. AFTER DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED THAT A BRIEF QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYZING AND DEFINING THE QUESTIONS THE AD HOC GROUP WOULD BE

CALLED ON TO ADDRESS FOLLOWING THE MID-DECEMBER BREAK
WOULD BE DISCUSSED BY THE THREE REPS IN THEIR NEXT
MEETING AND SUBSEQUENTLY IN THE AD HOC GROUP.

10. IN A BRIEF DISCUSSION OF STABILIZING MEASURES,
ALLIED REPS COMPARED NOTES AS TO PRESENT STATUS OF
NATIONAL THINKING. US REPS POINTED OUT THAT UK
REP IN PRESENTING AD HOC GROUP REPORT TO THE COUNCIL
ON DECEMBER 3 SHOULD NOT REPEAT NOT PRESENT IT AS THE
AGREED VIEW OF THE AD HOC GROUP THAT A FAVORABLE
COUNCIL DECISION WAS REQUIRED ON PRE-REDUCTION CON-
STRAINTS IN ORDER TO PERMIT ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES
TO DESCRIBE SOME SPECIFIC POSSIBILITIES TO THE EAST
IN VIENNA PLENARIES PRIOR TO THE MID-DECEMBER
BREAK. US VIEW WAS THAT STABILIZING MEASURES SHOULD
BE KEPT TOGETHER IN A SINGLE PACKAGE WHICH SHOULD BE
RAISED AT THE TIME IN THE NEGOTIATIONS MOST FAVORABLE
TO ELICIT A POSITIVE EASTERN RESPONSE. HENCE, THE US
REP IN THE AD HOC GROUP HAD NOT AGREED THAT A COUNCIL
DECISION ON EITHER PRE-REDUCTION MEASURES OR ON
STABILIZATION MEASURES AS A WHOLE WAS NECESSARY NOW
IN ORDER THAT IT MIGHT BE REFLECTED IN AD HOC GROUP
PLENARY PRESENTATIONS TO THE EAST. IN FACT, HE PREFERRED
UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS THAT NO SUCH ALLIED MENTION BE
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09922 02 OF 02 012130Z

MADE AT THIS TIME.

11. FRG REP SAID IT WOULD STILL BE USEFUL IN HIS
VIEW TO DISCUSS PRE-REDUCION CONSTRAINTS WITH THE
EAST. BUT IF NO AGREEMENT WERE REACHED IN THE COUNCIL
ON SPECIFIC PRE-REDUCTION MEASURES WHICH COULD BE MENTIONED
TO THE EAST PRIOR TO THE MID-DECEMBER BREAK, HE
WOULD AGREE THAT IT WOULD BE UNWISE TO BRING UP THE
SUBJECT OF PRE-REDUCTION CONSTRAINTS IN JANUARY. UNLESS
THE SUBJECT WERE MENTIONED TO THE EAST BEFORE THE
BREAK, THE ENTIRE ISSUE OF PRE-REDUCTION
CONSTRAINTS SHOULD BE DROPPED BY THE ALLIES. US
REPS POINTED OUT THAT IT WAS INSUFFICIENT FOR THE
ALLIANCE MERELY TO AGREE ON TITLES OF CERTAIN MEASURES
FOR PRESENTATION TO THE EAST UNLESS THE ALLIANCE WERE
ABLE AT THE SAME TIME TO AGREE ON THE GENERAL
OUTLINE OF THE DETAILS. IF THIS WERE NOT THE CASE,
THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE NO MATERIAL TO PRESENT IN
JANUARY IF IT WERE IN FACT THE COUNCIL'S DECISION
THAT STABILIZING MEASURES SHOULD BE
DISCUSSED PRIOR TO DISCUSSING DETAILS OF REDUCTIONS.
IF THE COUNCIL WERE GOING TO INSIST ON EARLY DIS-
CUSSION OF STABILIZING MEASURES, THIS DECISION SHOULD
HAVE AS A NECESSARY CONCOMMITANT COUNCIL AGREEMENT ON THEIR
DETAILS, OR THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD LOSE MOMENTUM.
A PRESENTATION IN JANUARY OF STABILIZING MEASURES

BY THE ALLIES WHICH WAS SLOW AND HALTING BECAUSE
THE NECESSARY DECISION ON DETAILS HAD NOT BEEN
REACHED WOULD HAVE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE
FLOW OF THE NEGOTIATIONS AND UNDERMINE THE ACCEPTABILITY
OF THE MEASURES CONCERNED. HUMES

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MBFR, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 DEC 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: mcintyresh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA09922
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731257/abqcelnx.tel
Line Count: 332
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: mcintyresh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 16 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <16-Jul-2001 by willialc>; APPROVED <27-Aug-2001 by mcintyresh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DECEMBER 1 DISCUSSION WITH UK AND FRG REPS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO NATO
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005